United Nations A/C.2/64/SR.39

General Assembly
Sixty-fourth session

Official Records

Distr.: General
5 February 2010

Original: English

Second Committee

Summary record of the 39th meeting
Held at Headquarters, New York, on Friday, 4 December 2009, at 11.30 a.m.

Chairperson: Mr. Park In-kook ..... (Republic of Korea)

Contents

Agenda item 51: Macroeconomic policy questions (*continued*)

(a) International trade and development (*continued*)

(d) Commodities (*continued*)

Agenda item 53: Sustainable development (*continued*)

(a) Implementation of Agenda 21, the Programme for the Further Implementation of Agenda 21 and the outcomes of the World Summit on Sustainable Development (*continued*)

(b) Follow-up to and implementation of the Mauritius Strategy for the Further Implementation of the Programme of Action for the Sustainable Development of Small Island Developing States (*continued*)

(c) International Strategy for Disaster Reduction (*continued*)

(d) Protection of global climate for present and future generations (*continued*)

This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

09-63325 (E)

Please recycle

The meeting was called to order at 11:50 a.m.

Agenda item 51: Macroeconomic policy questions (*continued*)

(a) International trade and development (*continued*) (A/C.2/64/L.50)

Draft resolution on unilateral economic measures as a means of political and economic coercion against developing countries

1. **Ms. Osman** (Sudan) introduced draft resolution A/C.2/64/L.50 on behalf of the Group of 77 and China.

(d) Commodities (*continued*) (A/C.2/64/L.5 and L.53)

Draft resolutions on commodities

2. **The Chairperson** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.2/64/L.53, which was being submitted by Mr. García González (El Salvador), Vice-Chairperson of the Committee, on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/64/L.5. The draft proposal had no programme budget implications.

3. He took it that the Committee was prepared to waive the 24-hour provision under rule 120 of the rules of procedure.

4. *Draft resolution A/C.2/64/L.53 was adopted.*

5. *Draft resolution A/C.2/64/L.5 was withdrawn.*

Agenda item 53: Sustainable development (*continued*) (A/C.2/64/L.24/Rev.1)

Draft resolution on harmony with nature

6. **The Chairperson** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.2/64/L.24/Rev.1, which contained no programme budget implications.

7. **Ms. Espósito Guevara** (Plurinational State of Bolivia) said that Brazil and Uruguay had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution.

8. Progress on sustainable development and the environment had taken place, but nonetheless the topic required further examination, given the serious impact of humans on the environment, which had been documented in numerous scientific studies. The draft resolution would provide an opportunity for examination of those effects as a whole.

9. The magnitude, scope and pace of anthropogenic change over the last half century had been unprecedented. The concept of harmony, encompassing the present and future well-being of both humans and nature, was therefore very important. The draft resolution sought to develop a perspective of balance between humans and nature that would allow for sustainability of life as a whole. Delegation input would allow, inter alia, for International Mother Earth Day to serve as a way of promoting activities related to a life in harmony with nature, with the involvement of all relevant international, regional and subregional organizations and the relevant bodies of the United Nations. While human life would always have an impact on the Earth, the challenge was to have an impact which would not destroy the equilibrium of the Earth system and ultimately harm human development as well.

10. **Ms. de Laurentis** (Secretary of the Committee) said that the following countries wished to become sponsors of the draft resolution: Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Guinea, Haiti, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mali, Malawi, Micronesia, Mozambique, Niger, Nigeria, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saudi Arabia, Solomon Islands, Tunisia and United Republic of Tanzania.

11. *Draft resolution A/C.2/64/L.24/Rev.1 was adopted.*

(a) Implementation of Agenda 21, the Programme for the Further Implementation of Agenda 21 and the outcomes of the World Summit on Sustainable Development (*continued*) (A/C.2/64/L.21/Rev.1)

Draft resolution on agricultural technology for development

12. **The Chairperson** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.2/64/L.21/Rev.1, which had no programme budget implications.

13. **Ms. Davidovich** (Israel), speaking as the main sponsor, said that Andorra, Botswana, Croatia and Peru had been added as sponsors.

14. **Ms. de Laurentis** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Belize and Timor-Leste wished to become sponsors.

15. **Mr. Al Bayati** (Iraq), speaking on behalf of the Arab Group, said that the Arab Group had requested a vote on the resolution and that its members would

abstain. Agricultural technology for development had already been covered in the resolution on agriculture development and food security submitted by the Group of 77 and China under agenda item 60, and the Israeli draft resolution failed to address issues of concern to developing countries, such as technology transfer and market access.

16. In any case, as the world's most prominent violator of United Nations resolutions, Israel had no standing to submit resolutions of its own, especially when it came to agriculture. Numerous reports from the Secretary-General, including one just considered by the Committee under agenda item 40, had demonstrated clearly how the policies of the Israeli occupation held back agricultural development in the Occupied Palestinian Territory and the occupied Syrian Golan. In the West Bank, the separation wall had affected tens of thousands of acres of fertile land accounting for close to 10 per cent of total Palestinian agricultural output. According to the World Bank, 17 per cent of cultivated land in the Gaza Strip had been destroyed in the recent Israeli war. The United Nations Fact Finding Mission on the Gaza Conflict had reported that Gaza's economy had been further severely affected by the reduction of the fishing zone open to Palestinian fishermen and the establishment of a "buffer zone" along the border between Gaza and Israel. A recent survey conducted by the World Food Programme and the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East estimated that over a third of Palestinians suffered from food insecurity. In the occupied Syrian Golan, Israeli land and water policies discriminated against Syrian farmers in favour of Israeli settlers.

17. Israel was using its resolution on agricultural technology for development to distract attention from policies deliberately designed to destroy agriculture in the territories it occupied. A vote in favour would only serve as an encouragement to Israel as it continued to uproot the olive trees whose very branches were a symbol of peace.

18. **The Chairman** informed the Committee that a recorded vote had been requested.

19. *A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.2/64/L.21/Rev.1.*

In favour:

Albania, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominica, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kazakhstan, Latvia, Lesotho, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Maldives, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nauru, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Palau, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Viet Nam.

Against:

None.

Abstaining:

Afghanistan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Comoros, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Egypt, Indonesia, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Namibia, Nicaragua, Oman, Pakistan, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Yemen, Zambia.

20. *Draft resolution A/C.2/64/L.21/Rev.1 was adopted by 131 votes to 0, with 37 abstentions.*

21. **Ms. Davidovich** (Israel) said that the broad spectrum of sponsors and supporters of the resolution,

which included developing countries as well as developed countries from both North and South, demonstrated the importance and wide appeal of the issue. It was troubling that the Arab Group, motivated by political considerations, had called for a vote on the resolution, which was in fact apolitical. However, it was gratifying that the Second Committee had recognized those unconstructive efforts for what they were, and not a single country had voted against the resolution. The resolution encouraged and promoted initiatives that harnessed the power of agriculture. Agricultural technology could bolster sustainable development in a manner that uplifted and empowered communities.

(b) Follow-up to and implementation of the Mauritius Strategy for the Further Implementation of the Programme of Action for the Sustainable Development of Small Island Developing States (*continued*) (A/C.2/64/L.15 and L.46)

Draft resolutions on follow-up to and implementation of the Mauritius Strategy for the Further Implementation of the Programme of Action for the Sustainable Development of Small Island Developing States

22. **The Chairperson** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.2/64/L.46, which was being submitted by Ms. McQuade (Ireland), the Rapporteur of the Committee, on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/64/L.15. An oral statement of programme budget implications had been prepared by the Secretariat in connection with the draft resolution.

23. **Ms. de Laurentis** (Secretary of the Committee) read out an operational note from the Department for General Assembly and Conference Management and an oral statement on programme budget implications prepared by the Secretariat in connection with the draft resolution now before the Committee. She said that both texts would be circulated to Member States.

24. In connection with the operational note, three high-level meetings of the General Assembly were scheduled or proposed for September 2010 during the sixty-fifth session of the General Assembly. They were the 2010 high-level plenary meeting of the General Assembly on the Millennium Development Goals, to last three days, the meeting on follow-up to and implementation of the Mauritius Strategy, to last two days, and the high-level event of the sixty-fifth session of the General Assembly to celebrate the International Year of Biodiversity, set to last one day. The events could not overlap, as they were all plenary meetings of the General Assembly. Should all three events take place between the adoption of the agenda on Friday, 17 September and the start of the general debate, currently planned for Thursday, 23 September, all available days, including the weekend, would be scheduled.

25. In connection with the oral statement on programme budget implications relative to draft resolution A/C.2/64/L.46, the relevant two-day high-level review meeting in September 2010 would necessitate an additional $117,300 in the proposed budget for the biennium 2010-2011, including $101,300 under Section 2, General Assembly and Economic and Social Council affairs and conference management and $16,000 under Section 28D, Office of Central Support Services, for other support services.

26. In order to provide full service for the high-level review, the Secretariat would seek to identify resources that could be redeployed from the provisions to be made under Section 2, General Assembly and Economic and Social Council affairs and conference management, and Section 28D, Office of Central Support Services, of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2010-2011, despite the fact that the modalities contained in draft resolution A/C.2/64/L.46 exceeded those planned by the Department for General Assembly and Conference Management in its draft calendar of conferences and meetings for 2010-2011.

27. The regional preparatory meetings requested in operative paragraph 6 of the draft resolution would be funded from extrabudgetary resources.

28. Accordingly, should the General Assembly adopt draft resolution A/C.2/64/L.46, no financial implications would arise under the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2010-2011.

29. **Ms. McQuade** (Ireland) (Rapporteur of the Committee), said that to reflect what had been agreed by delegations, the word "with" should be inserted in the second line of paragraph 11, between the words "including" and "the".

30. **Mr. Murakami** (Japan) requested clarification as to whether a decision had been taken to hold all three high-level events between 17 and 23 September 2010,

and whether that would entail budgetary implications. The possibility of holding the event on the International Year of Biodiversity on Saturday, 25 September had been mentioned, in a different context.

31. **Ms. de Laurentis** (Secretary of the Committee) said that no definitive decision regarding dates had yet been taken. The Department was merely drawing the attention of the Committee to the fact that all of the high-level events were being planned to occur close together in time. If a weekend meeting was required, the relevant office of the Secretariat would provide the programme budget implications.

32. *Draft resolution A/C.2/64/L.46, as orally revised, was adopted.*

33. *Draft resolution A/C.2/64/L.15 was withdrawn.*

(c) International Strategy for Disaster Reduction (*continued*) (A/C.2/64/L.10 and L.52)

Draft resolution on the International Strategy for Disaster Reduction

34. **The Chairperson** invited the Committee to take action on draft decision A/C.2/64/L.52.

35. **Ms. de Laurentis** (Secretary of the Committee), speaking on the programme budget implications of the draft resolution and referring to its paragraph 22, recalled that, by resolution 54/219 of 22 December 1999 on the successor arrangements for the International Decade for Natural Disaster Reduction, the General Assembly had established the Inter-Agency Secretariat of the International Strategy for Disaster Reduction and the Inter-Agency Task Force for Disaster Reduction which were financed exclusively from extrabudgetary resources. Therefore, the resolution had no programme budget implications.

36. *Draft resolution A/C.2/64/L.52 was adopted.*

37. *Draft resolution A/C.2/64/L.10 was withdrawn.*

(d) Protection of global climate for present and future generations (*continued*) (A/C.2/64/L.39 and L.54)

Draft resolutions on the protection of global climate for present and future generations of humankind

38. **The Chairperson** invited the Committee to take action on draft decision A/C.2/64/L.54. He took it that the Committee was prepared to waive the 24-hour provision of rule 120 of the rules of procedure.

39. **Ms. de Laurentis** (Secretary of the Committee), speaking on the programme budget implications of the draft resolution and referring to its paragraph 13, recalled that since the adoption of resolution 58/243 of 23 December 2003 on the protection of global climate for present and future generations of mankind, conference services for sessions of the Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change had been included as resources for recurrent activities in the regular budgets for all subsequent bienniums. On the understanding that the secretariat of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change would cover the incremental travel costs if meetings were held outside the seat of its headquarters in Bonn, Germany, and the costs of any additional meetings aside from the four already included in the 2010-2011 calendar of conferences and meetings of the United Nations, the resolution would not have any additional programme budget implications.

40. **Ms. McQuade** (Ireland) (Rapporteur of the Committee), said that two revisions had been made to the text. In the eighteenth preambular paragraph, the superscript "3" after the words "World Climate Conference" should be changed to a dash followed by the number 3, to read: "World Climate Conference – 3". In paragraph 6, the words "United Nations Climate Change Conference in" should be deleted and the words "United Nations Climate Change Conference" should replace the word "it" after the word "making"; the paragraph would then read: "*Encourages* Member States to approach Copenhagen with ambition, optimism and determination, with a view to making the United Nations Climate Change Conference a success".

41. *Draft resolution A/C.2/64/L.54, as orally revised, was adopted.*

42. *Draft resolution A/C.2/64/L.39 was withdrawn.*

43. **Mr. Gutiérrez** (Peru) said that his delegation had submitted a draft preambular paragraph based on the nineteenth preambular paragraph of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, which recognized that low-lying and other small island countries, countries with low-lying coastal, arid and semi-arid areas or areas liable to floods, drought and desertification, and developing countries with fragile mountainous ecosystems were particularly vulnerable to the adverse effects of climate change. It was

regrettable that the draft preambular paragraph had not been adopted. The work of the Committee should maintain a close and consistent connection with the continuing negotiations on climate change. It was important to clarify which countries were particularly vulnerable to climate change. Peru, which was one such country, would continue to work towards that end at the Copenhagen summit.

44. **Mr. Barton** (United States of America) said that although his delegation was pleased to join the consensus on the resolution, it wished to reaffirm the principle that treaty and convention bodies should be financed by voluntary contributions rather than from the regular budget of the Organization.

45. **Mr. Ström** (Sweden), speaking on behalf of the European Union, said that on the eve of the Copenhagen Climate Change Conference, he was pleased that consensus had been reached on the resolution, and in particular on paragraph 5 noting the call for completion of parallel work of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Long-term Cooperative Action under the Convention and the Ad Hoc Working Group on Further Commitments for Annex I Parties under the Kyoto Protocol and paragraph 6 encouraging Member States to approach the Conference with ambition, optimism and determination.

46. **Ms. Osman** (Sudan), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that the resolution reflected the relevance of the role of the General Assembly in supporting negotiations on the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change and the Kyoto Protocol. She expressed particular satisfaction with paragraph 5, as completion of the parallel work of the two working groups was a high priority for developing countries, and hoped that the atmosphere of honest and fruitful engagement that had characterized negotiations on the resolution would be carried through to the Copenhagen Conference.

47. **Mr. Rengifo** (Colombia) said that the resolution reaffirmed the support of the General Assembly for the Convention, the Kyoto Protocol and the forthcoming Copenhagen summit. General Assembly resolutions must respect the autonomy and priority of the Convention and the Protocol and promote their implementation, rather than attempting to renegotiate them. His delegation therefore wished to express a reservation with regard to the eighth preambular paragraph and paragraph 9 of the resolution. Those passages were inconsistent with the nineteenth preambular paragraph of the Convention in that they omitted any reference to particularly vulnerable countries. In the interests of consensus, his delegation had not insisted on including such a reference. However, Colombia would continue to work towards that end at the Copenhagen summit and in future deliberations of the Committee.

The meeting rose at 1.05 p.m.